

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 20 and 22 are amended. Accordingly, claims 20-23 are pending.

Applicant would like to point out that the rejection of claims 20-23 of the present application is improper for at least the following reasons.

With regard to claims 20 and 21 of the present application, Applicant would like to point out that each of claims 20 and 21 recites that the second script engine is different from the first script engine and is other than either a Java Virtual Machine or a Common Gateway Interface. The second script engine communicates with the web browser and the software agent infrastructure and operates to (i) parse script having a dedicated agent extension different from the extension indicative of Java script and (ii) translate data output from the portal agent to a format which can be interpreted by the web browser and thereby to establish a communication link between the web browser and the software agent infrastructure.

If the Office continues to reject claims 20 and 21 of the present application by Drummond et al. (“Drummond”), it is respectfully requested that the Office explain where Drummond discloses or suggests that the second script engine is different from the first script engine and is other than either a Java Virtual Machine or a Common Gateway Interface, as recited in each of claims 20 and 21 of the present application. Absent an adequate explanation, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 20 and 21 of the present application is improper and, therefore, should be withdrawn.


With regard to claims 22 and 23 of the present application, Applicant would like to point out that each of claims 22 and 23 recites, inter alia, “using a script engine which is other than either a Java Virtual Machine or a Common Gateway Interface to translate the request received from the web browser into a second format which is able to be interpreted by software agent infrastructure”.

If the Office continues to reject claims 22 and 23 of the present application by

Drummond, it is respectfully requested that the Office explain where Drummond discloses or suggests “using a script engine which is other than either a Java Virtual Machine or a Common Gateway Interface to translate the request received from the web browser into a second format which is able to be interpreted by software agent infrastructure”, as recited in each of claims 22 and 23 of the present application. Absent an adequate explanation, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 22 and 23 of the present application is improper and, therefore, should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Chan", is written over a horizontal line.

Michael Chan
Reg. No. 33,663
Attorney for Applicant

NCR Corporation, Law Department, WHQ-3E
1700 S. Patterson Blvd., Dayton, OH 45479-0001
Tel. No. 937-445-4956/Fax No. 937-445-6794

JUN 11 2009